MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

October 20, 1999
EESB Snoqualmie Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

PURPOSE

- To understand how SCFA is meeting Hanford needs and how to improve relationships
- To hear about alternatives to BNFL Privatization

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Debbie Trader, DOE-RL (AMT) was acting Chair in Lloyd's absence. She talked about the DOE reorganization under Keith Klein, the new Manager of RL. He is focusing Hanford on three outcomes:

1. Restore the River Corridor
2. Transition the Central Plateau
3. Put DOE's assets to work for the future

Shannon Saget reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda.

UPDATES

- **Corporate Performance Measures / EM-50 Planning Group Update –** Four corporate performance measures were discussed. The ad hoc committee met off-line and presented recommendations at the last meeting. A letter was distributed that documents the recommendations. Members were asked to take a couple of days to look at it and provide input back to Shannon by October 22.

- **In Situ Redox Manipulation Deployment –** An overview and update was given on the ISRM technology. ISRM has been chosen for deployment, and they are currently waiting for the Record of Decision to be signed. They plan to start drilling the wells in December 1999.

- **Carbon Tetrachloride ITRD Project –** The purpose of this project is to evaluate technologies that would help with characterization and remediation of carbon tet contamination in the vadose zone, groundwater, and DNAPL. They have reviewed about 24 technologies. They are now looking at some of the characterization technologies and a modeling effort to help with the remediation technologies.

SUBSURFACE CONTAMINANT FOCUS AREA PRESENTATION

Tom Hicks, DOE-SR, talked about SCFA's visit to Hanford. This is the second visit they have had this year. They are here to review all of our S&T needs to make sure that they have a good understanding of our needs and enhance our chances of getting our needs addressed. SCFA has a new lead-lab concept, which takes advantage of all the expertise in the National Labs. The lead labs will be responsible for long-range planning, special projects, technical assistance, and providing scientific consultation.

SUBGROUP UPDATES

It was announced that Ellen Dagan has a new assignment, and that Greg Sinton will be her replacement as Chair of the Mixed Waste Subgroup. It was announced that the two Decision Forms circulated for a vote by e-mail earlier had both passed. One was to change the name of the Subgroup and the other was to change the scope to include the Nuclear Materials Focus Area. It was noted that there was no report from the Tanks Subgroup. Debbie Trader indicated that RL is continuing to have discussions with Dick French on this issue.

ALTERNATIVES TO BNFL PRIVATIZATION

Don Wodrich talked about ongoing analyses to develop alternatives to BNFL privatization. ORP's baseline plan is to continue the privatization contract with BNFL, but they recognize that BNFL is behind schedule and an agreement may not be reached. ORP is working with BNFL to resolve difficulties and meet the baseline schedule. At the same time, ORP is looking at alternate paths forward should DOE and BNFL fail to reach agreement.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS / WRAP-UP

- CDI Update
- Immobilized Waste Storage – Canyon volume vs. empty tank volume
- Hanford Waste Disposition Maps and risk numbers
- Status of S&T Workshop recommendations
- FDH S&T needs assessment and tracking database
- Update from ORP on Tank Subgroup participation and accountability on budget
- ITRD Project on Tank Farm Infiltration (update)
- Site-Specific Advisory Board presentation (update)
- Keith Klein presentation
- Dick French presentation
- Reorganization impacts on STCG
- TIE Conference Update
- National STCG – what we want from the Focus Areas
- Sr-90 ITRD Update
- Incentives for S&T

The next meting will be changed from our normal schedule because of the Manager's meeting, which conflicts with our meeting. An announcement will be sent out regarding the next meeting.

ACTIONS

- Provide S&T Highlights and copy of Keith Klein's viewgraphs to the HAB.
- Distribute FDH Needs Assessment document to Management Council members.
- Send comments on S&T Corporate Performance Measures letter to Shannon by 10/22/99. Send comments on two attachments to Terry Walton.

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

October 20, 1999
EESB – Snoqualmie Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Debbie Trader, DOE-RL (AMT) was acting Chair in Lloyd's absence. She talked about the DOE reorganization under Keith Klein, the new Manager of RL. He is focusing Hanford on three outcomes:

1. Restore the River Corridor
2. Transition the Central Plateau
3. Put DOE's assets to work for the future

Keith would probably come to the STCG meeting in November or December to give his presentation if we would like. Debbie apologized for the lack of DOE managers at the meeting, and said that a meeting of all of Keith Klein's direct reports has been scheduled on top of our meetings. We will continue the meeting today, with the promise that we won't let it overlap again.

There will be two Deputy Managers at RL – Site Transition and Business Services. Bob Rosselli has been named the Deputy Manager for Business Services. Lloyd Piper is acting in the position of Deputy Manager for Site Transition until a permanent Deputy is named. Lloyd will be heading up the Office of Performance Assessment. It is thought that the Deputy Manager for Site Transition will chair the STCG Management Council.

The new Site Transition organization is focused on cleanup. The new Business Services organization includes the support organizations.

Key RL federal employee responsibilities include:

1. Establish the Hanford strategy
2. Organize to achieve strategy
3. Set expectations and incentives
4. Institute management controls
5. Authorize and nurture work
6. Assess performance
7. Feedback

HQ is also in the midst of realignment. The main two divisions are the Office of Site Closure (near-term) and the Office of Project Completion (long-term). Gerald Boyd continues to be Deputy Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology, and is now also responsible for long-term stewardship.

Shannon reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda.

UPDATES

Corporate Performance Measures / EM-50 Planning Group Update
Shannon Saget, DOE-RL / Jerry White, BHI

Four corporate performance measures were discussed. The ad hoc committee met off-line and presented recommendations at the last meeting. A letter was distributed that documents the recommendations. Members were asked to take a couple of days to look at it and provide input back to Shannon by October 22. The metrics recommended for S&T also drive cleanup outcomes; they're not just measures of S&T for its own sake.

Fluor Daniel Hanford has been preparing cost/benefit analyses; Terry Walton brought in two examples. They are working with Shannon and Craig Richins trying to come up with the best way to document cost savings and benefits. They looked at the return-on-investment (ROI) model used by the Pollution Prevention Program, but it implies that the only benefit is cost. They tried to convert worker safety and better performance to dollars. The ROI model provides a standardized method to document benefits. FDH deployed 16 technologies this year, and the significance of these deployments will be supported by the cost/benefit analysis. This approach is in the formative stage. Please provide comments back to Terry.

In Situ Redox Manipulation Deployment – Arlene Tortoso, DOE-RL

Several years ago, a high concentration of chromium was found in the pore water along the 100-D Area shoreline. From May 1997 through September 1999, a treatability study of In Situ Redox Manipulation (ISRM) was conducted for the 100-D Area hot spot. The Environmental Restoration Program built a small-scale ISRM treatment barrier wall with five injection wells. To determine how big a wall was needed and where it should go, lots of characterization wells were drilled in 1997-1998 to delineate the chromium plume. However, they have not really defined the source yet. FY 1999 ASTD funding was received for deployment of the technology.

The ISRM technology results in the hexavalent chromium being changed to trivalent chromium, which is immobile and less toxic. After placement of the barrier, concentrations of chromium have dropped from 1000 PPB to zero in that area. Based on that good news, the regulators agreed that ISRM should be deployed at the hot spot. The 1996 ROD requires the use of pump-and-treat technology in this area, so a ROD amendment has been developed for ISRM. They received five comments from the public review of the proposed amendment. Three comments strongly supported the deployment, one was a technical comment, and one didn't have anything to do with ISRM.

The ROD amendment calls for 14-15 injection wells for a 2000-foot barrier to be completed by 2002. They will start with a 600-foot barrier this year. In the next two years, they will add to the wall to get complete capture of the plume. They are hoping to have the ROD amendment signed next week, and then they can drill the wells from December 1999 through March 2000 for Phase I. Phase II will occur in 2001, and Phase III in 2002.

Questions/Comments:

Dib Goswami asked if ISRM would be used in the 100-K and 100-H Areas too. Arlene said that the cost estimates need to be refined before we propose to use IRSM for other chromium plumes. The ROD amendment is only for the 100-D Area. In situ gaseous reduction (ISGR) is being used to try to find the chromium source in the 100-D Area. Then they will consider source removal using ISGR.

Nancy Uziemblo asked if there was funding available in 2001 and 2002. Arlene said that project funds have been budgeted in the amount of approximately $1M for each year. ASTD funding has been received in the amount of $1.1M for FY 2000. Project funding is at $900K in FY 2000. Nancy commented that this is a good example of an innovative technology challenging the baseline, and now being put into a ROD. Debbie Trader added that this technology started 10-15 years ago with basic science and has moved all the way from technology development to demonstration to deployment. This success story will be presented on television in February 2000.

Pam Brown asked if something like this was being used for other chemicals to change their structure. Arlene said that ISRM is being used at Ft. Lewis for trichloroethylene (TCE).

Dib Goswami added that more than 40 different sites are using permeable barrier technology. He asked if the current pump and treat will continue at the same rate. Arlene said yes.

Carbon Tetrachloride ITRD Project – Arlene Tortoso, DOE-RL

In early 1999, RL started a cooperative project with Sandia National Laboratory and EM-50 on remediation of carbon tetrachloride (carbon tet) contamination. ITRD funds Sandia as a facilitator to bring in experts in a particular contaminant to solve a problem through innovative technology. DOE, the stakeholders, the regulators and others get together to try to solve the problem.

The purpose is to identify and evaluate technologies for characterization and remediation of carbon tet contamination in the vadose zone, groundwater, and DNAPL. They will evaluate which technologies can cost-effectively address the source term as well as diffuse portions of the plume. Twenty-four technologies have been reviewed to date. They are now discussing modeling efforts to evaluate a number of different strategies for attacking the plume.

Modeling is required to:

- Provide a realistic model of contaminant attenuation, dispersion, transport, etc.,
- Provide an engineering-level assessment of remediation options, and
- Help guide recommendations for cost-effective remediation strategies based on the overall modeling of performance cost.

When the modeling is finished, the 24 technologies will be analyzed in more detail.

Questions/Comments:

Terry Walton asked about in-situ bioremediation technology. Is that something that might be evaluated? Arlene said that information coming out of the bioremediation demonstration is that it is not cost-effective, however in situ bioremediation has been retained as one of the 24 technologies to evaluate.

Pam Brown said that with the challenges we have in the vadose zone, it has been found that a lot of modeling hasn't worked. Are there new modeling techniques being used? Arlene said that the modeling effort they are doing now is one that is based on modeling work done back in 1994-1995. They looked at all contaminant plumes on the Site over 200-year time frames. They are using some of the concepts of that model and refining some of the variables rather than creating a new model. The model is accepted by the whole group.

Dib Goswami asked about funding for the project. Arlene said that currently all funding is coming from EM-50 and the ITRD. EM-40 is looking for matching funds for the PIT tests.

SUBSURFACE CONTAMINANT FOCUS AREA PRESENTATION
Tom Hicks, DOE-SR

Jerry White introduced Tom Hicks from the Subsurface Contaminant Focus Area (SCFA). Several SCFA representatives are at Hanford this week to review our S&T needs. They want to improve communications and ensure that they have a good understanding of our needs and can enhance our chances of getting them addressed.

This is the second visit SCFA has had to Hanford this year. What they have found is that they need to come early on in the process so they have time to act on the information. They are looking for changes in the S&T needs. Tom thinks it is advantageous to discuss the needs face-to-face, since the formats vary from site to site. The better their understanding of the needs, the better they can focus their responses (both technology development and technical assistance).

SCFA has a new distributed lead-lab concept – basically taking advantage of all the expertise in the National Labs. Dr. Jack Cory, SRTC, is managing the program. There are partners all across the Complex. A point of contact has been established at each site. SCFA is anxious to see how this concept works. Terry Walton was involved early on to help develop the concept.

The SCFA and Hanford enjoy an excellent relationship. The Focus Area has representatives that serve on the regional steering committee, and Wayne Martin (PNNL) is Hanford's lead lab point of contact. Hanford is proactive in taking advantage of opportunities and keeping a good, open dialogue going. Jerry White has been instrumental in keeping the discussions going with SCFA regarding Hanford's needs, and in developing strategies for getting EM-50 dollars.

Under Tom French's direction, they instituted a peer review process. One of the first opportunities to use the process was the ISRM project at Hanford. It had technical issues that were brought forward by the tribes and regulators. SCFA was able to work through some of those issues. ISRM has been funded to the point where perhaps it will be used as a final remedy.

SCFA also helped fund the In Situ Gaseous Reduction technology, so the two technologies could be used in combination to solve the 100-Area vadose zone and groundwater contamination problems. The Hanford ITRD projects are also funded by SCFA. Thus, the Focus Area has been a very active player in solving Hanford problems. Now we need to identify areas where we need technical assistance from SCFA and test that new system.

Questions/Comments:

Nancy Uziemblo is looking for correlations between Hanford's S&T needs and SCFA's responses. She is looking at the FY 2000 FINPLAN to determine how the needs fit into what is funded. Tom said that the question has come up at DOE-HQ regarding how well the Focus Areas have responded to the sites' needs. The dilemma is that SCFA operates at the work package level (comprised of similar needs that have been collected from the sites and rolled up). Then they prioritize those work packages based on feedback from the Complex. HQ then prioritizes work packages across all the Focus Areas. That is the basis for the funding decisions. SCFA gets funding relative to those work packages. Projects must be tied to a particular site where they will be demonstrated and hopefully deployed. When a work package is compared to a particular site's need, there may be slight changes. A technology might be demonstrated at a different site, but it might also meet your similar need. The dialog that occurs at an SCFA site visit gives SCFA an opportunity to feed back the information to the site. Tom feels that a one-time response to the site's needs would be inaccurate because of constant changes. SCFA would like to work with each site to discuss and come up with an accurate response to their needs.

Terry Walton agreed that we need accurate responses to our needs. The PHMC is looking at three of Hanford's biggest S&T needs areas (TRU/characterization, surface decontamination, and remote-handled equipment), representing about 40% of our needs. The tools we're developing on Site help to bridge the gap between SCFA's work packages and our Site's needs. We are a little more prepared to go back to the Focus Area to address those needs.

Jerry White said that one of the things we committed to do is to provide a presentation on what SCFA funded and how it responds to our needs, and what they didn't fund and why. We have a better understanding this year than we have had in the past. Tom said that this issue is going to be raised at the next National STCG meeting. HQ is hoping that the meeting will result in guidance to the Focus Areas.

Dennis Faulk encouraged Tom to set aside some time to talk to the regulators. Tom said that the things they are developing (e.g., special studies) need involvement by the regulators. The regulations may change from one state to another. Regulator involvement would be very useful. Next time they schedule visits at Hanford, they will met with the regulators.

Dib Goswami commented that he has seen Tom for the first time today. It looks like they have been having conversations with BHI, FDH, and PNNL, but without the regulators present, they are missing the whole connection. He emphasized that the regulators need to be involved.

Jerry White said that he intended to get the regulators invited to all of the agenda items. It was a glitch; they should have been invited. Tom said that each site has their own relationship with

their regulators. SCFA tries to work with groups like the Western Governor's Association and EnviroIssues (out of Seattle). They are supposed to be involved with the regulators. It's up to each site to determine how the Focus Areas work with the regulators.

Pam Brown stated that our STCG Subgroups have worked hard to articulate needs that are clear and usable. How is our Site doing? Tom said that the needs statements provide the tool that SCFA uses to help direct their program. Each site has their own way of identifying needs, depending on how much funding they have. Some sites will write the needs statements without ever having been in the field. The Hanford Site is the benchmark in terms of writing their needs statements. They have been, for the most part, very clear. There are other sites that have also been very good at writing their needs statements; not only in writing them, but in their attitudes (e.g., making sure the Focus Area understands the needs). Hanford is the leader.

Pam also said that the stakeholders have heard that some of the other Focus Areas have been doing a better job of integrating. It was felt that there wasn't very effective communication between sites. She asked if there has been some effort to increase work and information flows between sites. Tom said that there are a lot more variables involved in SCFA problems. SCFA has established the lead-lab program to help with this. They also hired a communications person. The question is how we get everyone communicating – if anyone has any suggestions for improvement, let us know. We are falling short in this particular area and are looking for ways to improve.

Terry Walton said that, when SCFA gets their budget every year, he hopes that they think about those Hanford folks as "can-do" folks. We would like to say thank you for past support. We just heard from Arlene about some very good accomplishments funded by SCFA.

Gary Ballew asked if ITRD is fully funded by SCFA. Tom indicated that they approached the budget this year anticipating that SCFA would fully fund it. They are anticipating some EM-40 funding through the AL office, but he has not seen evidence of that.

Gary also asked how the SCFA lead lab relates to the EM lead lab. Since Tom doesn't really know the mission of the EM lead lab, he couldn't answer the question. He said that the SCFA lead lab is not directly tied to Idaho; it is set up to help SCFA's organization.

Dennis Faulk agreed with Jerry and thinks the ITRD has helped us to define our strategies. He suggested that they consider putting more funding into that. It is very useful. He would like to see an ITRD project at Hanford focused on surface barrier concepts.

Tom said that their Lead Labs are responsible for long-range planning, special projects, technical assistance, and providing scientific consultation. SCFA's Work Package 4 (barriers) is lacking funding. The message did get to HQ. They were willing to move the priority up the line. They wanted to know just what kind of research has been done on long-term barriers. SCFA made a suggestion that we use our lead lab program to create a design document. A number of players will be involved to make sure the scope of work is adequate and addresses what issues need to be worked through. Hanford and Sandia will be involved. It is not limited to National Labs.

SUBGROUP UPDATES

Subcon

It was announced that Fred Serier has taken a new assignment and Arlene Tortoso, the Subgroup Co-Chair, will become the Subcon Subgroup Chair.

Mixed Waste – Steve Weakley

It was announced that Ellen Dagan has a new assignment, and that Greg Sinton will be her replacement as the Mixed Waste Subgroup Chair.

The Mixed Waste Subgroup had a presentation from Ron Brodzinski on a monitoring system for detection of Cesium, Strontium and TRU at Savannah River. It could have some application here at Hanford.

Remote size reduction needs at Hanford are being described in a paper to be sent to the MWFA for funding. Representatives from the MWFA will be in town next week to discuss this effort and may provide $100K of funding for this work.

PNNL is putting a proposal together to send to the MWFA for research on a hydrogen getter for TRUPACT shipping containers. Work on the certification of a boxed waste assay system for WRAP is on hold until further funding is obtained.

The MWFA sent us their FY 2000 goals and strategies for review and comment. In addition, Subgroup members are reviewing the draft of the MWFA Multi-Year Program Plan.

Terry Walton thinks that the MWFA is not doing much for Hanford. Dialog with us helps them support their program, but hasn't been very useful for Hanford yet. They are coming out again on November 4. We need to take our specific needs statements and translate them into what the Focus Area can do for us.

Deactivation and Decommissioning – Roger Pressentin

There were two updates on ongoing ASTD projects given at the last Subgroup meeting. The Robot Work Platform project has issued an RFP, and work on the Laser Cutter project will now take place at Los Alamos rather than NTS. A glove box has been shipped to a vendor for a cold demonstration next week of a new laser cutting system.

Roger also provided an update on CDI activities. The Andros robot was deployed in the ventilation tunnel. An infrared detection device was also deployed. They are finding that the cells are much cleaner than the old pictures show. Over six cells have been opened.

A pre-proposal was developed for a decontamination system for manipulator arms being used in the 324 and 327 Buildings. In addition, a new need statement is being developed concerning personnel monitoring.

Two decision forms were circulated offline for voting. One was to change the name of the Subgroup from "Decontamination and Decommissioning" to "Deactivation and

Decommissioning". The other was to change the scope to include the Nuclear Materials Focus Area. Both issues were voted on by e-mail and passed. Results were:

Name Change

YES	8
NO	1
ABSTAIN	0

Scope Change

YES	7
NO	1
ABSTAIN	1

Personnel from the Nuclear Materials Focus Area will be at Hanford either the last week of November or the first part of December.

Nancy Uziemblo said that she wants to hear from the Tanks Subgroup. She said, "If you play in the EM-50 sandbox, you need to be part of the STCG." Debbie Trader indicated that RL is continuing to have discussions with Dick French on this issue.

ALTERNATIVES TO BNFL PRIVATIZATION
Don Wodrich, DOE-ORP

Don said that he would talk more about the ongoing analyses than about specific alternatives. The results are not completed yet anyway, and will likely be Business Sensitive when they are.

Why they are developing and evaluating alternatives:

- To enhance the baseline plan/BNFL contract
- To compare the BNFL contract with alternatives to determine the best value for the government
- To have an alternate path forward should DOE and BNFL fail to reach agreement on proceeding with the contract
- To gain the support of DOE-HQ, Congress, and others by understanding alternatives to the BNFL contract

They have looked at ways the current path might fail (technology/technical, regulatory, financial, and business/contractual) and developed mitigating actions or conducted alternatives studies in technical scope, financing structure, and contracting methods.

Studies are being done to look at alternatives for enhancing the primary path (BNFL) and alternatives to the primary path. Programmatic alternatives outside of the EIS-ROD are also being evaluated (e.g., What happens if we can't do either of the above?).

There is a tentative TPA milestone in March to summarize alternatives. It hasn't been decided how far to go with alternative paths.

EM-50 led a study of technical alternatives (Dr. Harry Harmon) that was done to reduce the risk to DOE of failures and delays. They identified potential technical improvements and backup technologies for HLW remediation.

Summary

The next six months will be interesting times. Our goal is the same, but we are looking at alternatives.

- Our plan is to reach agreement with BNFL and proceed with Phase I, Part B-2 of the privatization contract.
- We recognize that BNFL is behind schedule and agreement may not be reached.
- ORP is working with BNFL to resolve difficulties and meet the schedule.
- Our goal remains the same – to build a vitrification plant, treat the waste, and safely dispose of it.

Questions/Comments:

Pam Brown asked if they had a process for communicating decisions to congressional staff. Don said that the report on the Harry Harmon technical alternatives study is in printing and will be distributed soon.

Nancy Uziemblo asked, "What if Lockheed pulls out. What are the consequences?" Don said that the goal is to make the transition quickly – do it sooner rather than later.

Pam Brown asked how the tank technology needs would be forwarded to the Tanks Focus Area (TFA) if there is no STCG Tank Subgroup. Don said that ORP could forward their needs. Debbie Trader interjected that, from the TFA perspective, the STCG does not need to endorse the needs. It's Hanford's wish to get the STCG Subgroups involved. That's where some of the difficulty has come in getting ORP to participate in the STCG.

Dennis Faulk asked how optimistic Don was that they would be able to hit the ground running either with BNFL or an alternate path. Don indicated that any alternate path would result in a schedule slip. Time will tell with BNFL. According to the BNFL schedule, the first facility will be on line in 2007. Dick French's challenge is to do it by 2005.

Nancy Uziemblo commented that, of the potential failure modes, the one that concerns her most is financial. If we don't see the funding, it won't happen. How is ORP/BNFL going to convince private investors and Congress to put the funding together? Don said that the FY 2000 budget would tell us. That's when the funding bumps up from $100M to $600M. From the BNFL standpoint, we've looked at a range of government backing to reduce the risk for investors, equity from BNFL, recourse, and non-recourse loans. It will be a mixture of all those things. ORP has hired an expert from the private sector to help with financing.

Nancy also asked what BNFL is doing about being behind schedule. Don said there have been some meetings between DOE and BNFL asking that very question. The biggest concern is whether Congress will really fund this.

Gordon asked about the congressionally mandated independent review on alternative contracting and financing methods. Don was not familiar with that particular review. Gordon agrees that financing from Congress is the key factor. He is very worried. Don agreed and said that projects that take many years to carry out are very difficult to fund.

Roger Pressentin asked if ORP is involved with any of the big five accounting firms. Don said that they have some outside consultants, but he didn't know which ones.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS / WRAP-UP

Linda Fassbender pointed out the future agenda items remaining on our Strategic Agenda items list and asked if there were any more to add.

Terry Walton indicated earlier that he could give a presentation on the FDH S&T needs assessment and tracking database.

Nancy Uziemblo suggested that we add time for discussions with ORP to be involved in the STCG Tank Subgroup. She said ORP must be accountable for the $6.5M they are getting from EM-50. They are doing some very good things with the S&T money. Maybe we should hear about it.

Gordon wants to hear an update on the Tank Farm Infiltration ITRD Project.

Pam Brown would like an update on the Site-Specific Advisory Board meeting (Pam, Nancy, and Shannon, including Nancy's joke).

We should invite Keith Klein and Dick French to visit the Management Council to hear what our concerns are.

Gary Ballew would like to hear more about how the reorganization impacts the STCG.

Dennis Faulk suggested we have an update on TIE conference.

National STCG – what we want from the Focus Areas. How should the Focus Areas be responsive to the sites? HQ is pushing them to standardize, which will feed into a great database that is useless.

Dennis Faulk would like an update on the Sr-90 ITRD Project.

Terry Walton suggested we talk about incentives for S&T. The PHMC and RL have been engaged in what drives S&T activities. What they have done in the incentive areas will go a long ways in improving contractor behavior.

Future Agenda Items

- CDI Update
- Immobilized Waste Storage – Canyon volume vs. empty tank volume
- Hanford Waste Disposition Maps and risk numbers
- Status of S&T Workshop recommendations
- FDH S&T needs assessment and tracking database
- Update from ORP on Tank Subgroup participation and accountability on budget
- ITRD Project on Tank Farm Infiltration (update)
- Site-Specific Advisory Board presentation (update)
- Keith Klein presentation
- Dick French presentation
- Reorganization impacts on the STCG
- TIE Conference Update
- National STCG – what we want from the Focus Areas
- Sr-90 ITRD Update
- Incentives for S&T

Shannon Saget announced that the next meeting would not be on the same date (third Wednesday) because of the Manager's meeting, which conflicts with our meeting. A message will be sent out regarding the next meeting.

Pam Brown announced that the Hanford Advisory Board has chosen a new member to be part of the Management Council – Tony Brooks, WSU.

ACTIONS

- Provide S&T Highlights and copy of Keith Klein's viewgraphs to the HAB.
- Distribute FDH Needs Assessment document to Management Council members.
- Send comments on S&T Corporate Performance Measures letter to Shannon by 10/22/99. Send comments on two attachments to Terry Walton.